

Citizen Comments – July 8, 2009
Second Public Presentation



Comments recorded on green comment cards:

Citizen:

Connect 4th Street to Downtown via Route 66 as a walkable corridor (already bike-able).

Survey every household within ½ mile of 4th Street to see what they want.

Incentives economic development on Southside to encourage student focus – keep students in Flagstaff on weekends (they go to Phoenix).

Citizen:

The existence of wildlife linkages as well as resident wildlife needs to be considered early in the development process in all transects. This consideration would benefit both humans and wildlife. The existence of wildlife should also be considered in redevelopment for the protection of humans as well as wildlife. For example there is a range of wildlife living in (or passing through) west Downtown Flagstaff.

Citizen:

Agree with apt blogs; two story box additions/need better massing. Not sure about commercial creep – use this tool wisely. Absolutely agree with providing higher quality housing. Bikes belong! Absolutely agree! Agree with no big boxes. Apts. are ok – helps with housing issues. Need more use of natural materials – adobe & stucco are natural as are many modern materials!!! Don't limit use of different materials. Need to allow public input during public presentation time – other issues need to be aired in a public forum. Thanks for the comment period at the end. Downtown compromise – residential next to commercial is not necessarily a bad thing. Need to balance this – mixed use.

Citizen:

The current way of identifying natural resources in our community is limited to identifying slopes, flood plains, and trees. This misses some important resources. What about preserving other natural vegetation types? Does the absence of trees, flood plains, and slopes mean that there are “no” natural resources on a place like McMillan Mesa? If we identified natural grasslands as important, would current development southwest side of McMillan mesa be occurring? Would Buffalo Park be as popular if it was ponderosa forest? I think the open grasslands are particularly valuable, but not recognized. Please review attached diagram that illustrates a design for development that values meadows over woodlands.

Citizen:

To reduce Downtown thru traffic, get rid of left turn arrow from eastbound Route 66 to San Francisco. Encourage this traffic to go up Humphrey's Street by having 2 East-to-North turn lanes.

The beeping noise on the electronic survey machines, especially during discussion, makes that survey method completely unacceptable. This is but one example of how we ignore noise as an issue.

Citizen:

Everyone is talking about zoning in the inner city area. More time needs to be spent on areas where the character is more rural.

An important concept is not just bicycle routes, but also HORSE routes from areas where horses are allowed to the nearest public land.

It does give me heartburn that the maps show so much of the Walnut Canyon Study area as NOT GREEN. Please work on fixing that.

Citizen:

Design is critical to community architecture. Education and incentives as to goals, appropriate, sustainable, and affordable design is also needed. There can be a huge variation in design that will work. However, it most likely falls to the City and others to demonstrate and teach these concepts. Idea in Palo Alto is a good example of innovative design process that can be utilized.

Citizen:

I would like to see the Code broad enough to have an easement for multiples in its interpretation yet plain enough for regular people to get the just of it. Keep old unique buildings and new arm in arm (more compressed - not as duplicative). Create a defined designated area for economic development to have its own place in the code as a transect (its own section). The way the Code looks must connect to how it will affect the economy.

Citizen:

Our City parks are an excellent place to include appropriate public art and such places should be identified appropriately. Public art should not be treated as an accessory that is "stuck" in places as an afterthought. Environmentally sensitive areas seem most appropriate.

Citizen:

The candor of your bullets/comments on the hanging drawings is refreshing. Please continue to tell it like you see it.

I appreciated the question and response regarding the re-write of the existing Code; it does need added clarity and simplicity.

Citizen:

Encourage internet and newspaper publicity to summarize, in detail, various code changes. Purpose is to draw out support/opposition soon enough in advance to avoid last minute controversy that might arise very late in the process.

Citizen:

Create incentives in T3/T4 for a developer to create pedestrian alleyway use. Basically, alleyways are pre-existing 20-foot non-motor easements.

T6/T5 alleyways allow narrow, deep commercial property to convert building rear-front into store fronts – that's incentive enough.

Citizen:

Preserve: prairie character of McMillan Mesa. Development on the mesa should blend in with roof color etc, so it is not visible from across town. We see the mesa as we look at Peaks.

Improve: 4th Street corridor and east Route 66. Thin the forest to reduce fire risks.

Safety: Bike lane on Butler Ave., Foxglenn to Milton Rd. Urban trail E-W is not a substitute for Butler bike route. Walkability in all neighborhoods. Seed wild flowers. When staff cut weeds, leave the wild flowers, rather than chop it all.

Citizen:

- 1) How are micro (home-based) businesses and cottage industries viewed in this process? Will this non-traditional economic development approach/strategy be accommodated in selected zones and neighborhood or city wide (residentially)?
- 2) How are the economically disadvantaged and their special needs and concerns being considered?
- 3) Parking is a problem most everywhere. Will residential parking be allowed on cinders or pavers (off driveway)?

Citizen:

I think the airport industrial park area/open space/Ponderosa Trails neighborhood should be considered a mixed-use, walkable area. There are already paths (paved) that many residents run/walk/bike, and this area should not be ignored as mixed use, as in the future it will become mixed use.

Citizen:

Even though historically architectural guidelines are supplemental to the zoning code as a separate chapter, we should be more progressive in Flagstaff with the next version of the code and fully integrate architectural guidelines into our code.

Citizen:

On the maps, please indicate major roadways (I-17, I-40, Lake Mary Rd.); are they interactive on the website so when you drag your mouse cursor over an area, it pops up with a box that tells you where you are (NAU, University Heights neighborhood). For newer residents to Flagstaff (5 yrs or less) this would be very helpful.

Citizen:

Infill a priority. Clean environment – assessment of properties necessary prior to development or redevelopment. Protect open space both in town and forest access. Bike lanes – non-motorized commuter traffic important.

Comments recorded on the flip chart for public discussion/questions:

- One way streets in Downtown are in conflict with a pedestrian friendly feeling.
- New zoning code – create expectations of doing better with flexibility. Continue to build on the strengths of the existing code.
- Following the last update of the LDC change was good – but we can still do better
- Response to Dan's comments on the design guidelines Focus Group promoting natural materials and applying them to the Transect – Do not limit the use of variation and modern/new technologies in materials
- Fourth Street Corridor should be considered a Form-based Code area
- Think outside the box in terms of application of the Form-based Code to get owners to participate. Concern for only making the Form-based Code voluntary as an overlay
- Do not have the charrette opening on Tuesdays (council meetings). Opening on Monday and closing on Friday.
- Be as prompt as possible in feeding information to the internet – this will help ensure people do not have problems at the end of the process
- How will the Form-based Code work with the existing Landmarks Historic Overlay or other Historic Overlays? Will be in addition to these existing overlays
- Include pre-historic and historic corridors and cultural aspects of Flagstaff's history into the code

- Will the Form-based Code be applicable to other parts of the City? There will be overlap, but each area has its own unique character. But the overall form and common thread is creating walkability
- Applying a Form-based Code to downtown seems like an easy approach for application. The 4th Street Corridor, Southside and Route 66 Corridor are more likely for future development and should need more guidance and control form a Form-based Code.
- TND ordinance will be applicable to infill areas in the City
- Discussion on the Form-based Code as only optional:
How do we overcome the issue of vested property rights under the existing code when development under the new code may cost more – people will likely default to the minimum standards
 - Emphasis on incentives to choose the optional Form-based Code
 - Intent is to carefully thin about this – find practical solutions
 - Try to get ‘buy-in’ form property owners to make it mandatory
- Urban-rural transect – need to deal with the transitions from urban to semi-rural. Transect will not necessarily apply across all of Flagstaff
- Flagstaff’s uniqueness with regard to the Transect – in many places will move from T3/T4 to T1 in a very short distance.

Responses to questions on the XitPoll machines:

There were 124 responses to all questions recorded.

- Did you enjoy tonight’s presentation?
 Yes 68%
 Kinda 32%
 No 0
- Do you like Flagstaff’s urban character?
 Yes 60%
 Kinda 40%
 No 0
- Is Flagstaff a great place to live?
 Yes 84%
 Maybe 12%
 No 4%

- How do you mostly travel in Flagstaff?

Car	18 responses
Bike	4 responses
Walk	0 responses
Bus	1 response
Other	2 responses

- Is a more sustainable Flagstaff important to you?

Yes	75%
Kinda	21%
No	4%